

they in principle conspire together to make up one sense and harmony: but the contrary (saith he) is most evident in the world; and, therefore, there cannot be many principles, but only one.—From whence it is manifest, that though Aristotle were a worshipper of many gods, as well as the other Pagans (he somewhere representing it as very absurd to sacrifice to none but Jupiter), yet he was no, Polytheist, in the sense before declared, of many unmade, self-existent deities, nor indeed any Ditheist neither, no assertor of two understanding principles, a good and evil god (as Plutarch pretended him to be); he not only here exploding that opinion of *iro||al* «pX^a many principles, but also expressly deriving all from one; and in that very chapter affirming, that good is a principle, but not evil. But as for the Platonists and Pythagoreans there perstringed by him, though it be true, that they made ideas in some sense principles, as the paradigms of things; yet, according to Aristotle's own confession, even in that same chapter, they declared also, that there was *aXXri apyrj* /cupwr^a, another principle more excellent or superior; which is indeed that, that was called by them the *ro ev*, or /xovac, unity itself, or a monad, that is, one most simple deity.

Though we did before demonstrate, that the Pagan gods were not all supposed by them to be unmade, self-existent beings, because they acknowledged a theogonia, a generation and temporary production of gods; yet, forasmuch as it might be suspected, that they held notwithstanding a multitude of unmade deities, we have now made the best inquiry that we could concerning this: and the utmost that we have been able yet